



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION**

ALEXANDRA STASKO,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No.: 3:22-4139-MGL
	§	
CROMER BABB PORTER & HICKS, LLC;	§	
SAMANTHA E. ALBRECHT (#102642), <i>in her</i>	§	
<i>individual capacity</i> ; and JAIME SUSANNE	§	
MISENHIEMER, <i>in her individual capacity</i> ,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND SUMMARILY DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT
WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

Plaintiff Alexandra Stasko (Stasko), proceeding pro se, filed a complaint against Defendants Cromer Babb Porter & Hicks, LLC, Samantha E. Albrecht, and Jaime Susanne Misenhiemer, alleging defamation.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court summarily dismiss the complaint without prejudice and without issuance and service of process for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on December 9, 2022. To date, Stasko has failed to file any objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court Stasko’s complaint is summarily **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 10th day of January 2023, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.